

Message

From: Dennis, Allison [Dennis.Allison@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/6/2019 10:18:33 PM
To: Ebbert, Laura [Ebbert.Laura@epa.gov]
CC: Drinkard, Andrea [Drinkard.Andrea@epa.gov]
Subject: Re: EPA Rosemont files from Tony Davis

Hi Laura,

Thanks for raising this to our attention.

Ow will work with OGC to answer this media inquiry, working in coordination with you. For all future inquires topic, please continue to send them to me.

Sent from my iPhone

> On Mar 6, 2019, at 4:39 PM, Ebbert, Laura <Ebbert.Laura@epa.gov> wrote:
>
>
>
> Laura Ebbert
> Acting Chief of Staff
> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
> 75 Hawthorne Street
> San Francisco, CA 94105
> (415) 947-3561
>
> From: PerezSullivan, Margot
> Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 1:32 PM
> To: Quast, Sylvia <Quast.Sylvia@epa.gov>; Strauss, Alexis <Strauss.Alexis@epa.gov>; Blake, Ellen <Blake.Ellen@epa.gov>
> Cc: Campbell, Rich <Campbell.Rich@epa.gov>; Goldman, Elizabeth <Goldman.Elizabeth@epa.gov>; Ebbert, Laura <Ebbert.Laura@epa.gov>; Glenn, William <Glenn.William@epa.gov>
> Subject: FW: EPA Rosemont files from Tony Davis
>
> Greetings – see inquiry from Tony Davis below. My instinct is that these should be directed at Mike or higher (perhaps someone in HQ?). Your input on this is appreciated.
>
> Many thanks,
> margot
>
> Margot Perez-Sullivan
> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
> D: 415.947.4149
> C: 415.412.1115
> E: perezsullivan.margot@epa.gov<mailto:perezsullivan.margot@epa.gov>
>
> From: Davis, Tony <TDavis@tucson.com<mailto:TDavis@tucson.com>>
> Sent: Wednesday, March 06, 2019 10:47 AM
> To: PerezSullivan, Margot <PerezSullivan.Margot@epa.gov<mailto:PerezSullivan.Margot@epa.gov>>
> Subject: EPA Rosemont files from Tony Davis
>
>
> Margot,
>
> I have attached the three EPA memos on Rosemont that I was talking about just now. The first one, on the HMMP, I already wrote about, as you know, but I'm sending them all out of a sense of completeness. The Hudbay responses will come in another email.
>
> My questions about the EPA decision not to elevate the case:
>
> a) These three memos offer very sharp, very detailed criticism of the mine on many grounds, including opinions that the mine's groundwater drawdown will cause significant impacts, that the mine will cause significant degradation of Waters of the US and that the mine's mitigation plan, featuring re-establishment of Sonoita Creek and the Sonoita Creek Ranch purchase in general, is inadequate for many reasons.
>
> Given all those criticisms, and given EPA's statements early on that Rosemont could be a good candidate for elevation, what were the agency's reason or reasons for not elevating this to DC for further review?
>
> b) Did Hudbay's responses prove convincing to EPA?

>
> c) If so, is that one reason the agency chose not to elevate this case?
>
> d) If EPA's answer to question b is yes, could EPA please elaborate on what it found convincing about
Hudbay's responses, since the agency has been raising many of these concerns or very similar concerns
since 2012?
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Tony Davis
> 520-806-7746 o
> 520-349-0350 c
> <2017.11.30- EPA - Final HMMP Comments with Transmittal Letter- to USACE (1).pdf>
> <Rosemont FOIA EPA 2017 Significant Deg Comments with Transmittal Letter- to USACE.pdf>
> <Rosemont FOIA 2017 EPA - Groundwater Drawdown Comments with Transmittal Letter- to USACE.pdf>